

50 California Street, Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94111 Tel: (415) 398-5326 Fax: (415) 796-0846

May 28, 2019

Michael Rosauer Project Manager California Public Utilities Commission 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Monthly Report Summary #5 for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Rosauer,

Construction for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project began on November 5, 2018. This report provides a summary of the compliance monitoring activities that occurred during the period from **March 1 to 31, 2019**, for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project in Fresno County, California. Compliance monitoring was performed to ensure that all project-related activities conducted by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) and their contractors comply with the requirements of the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Final IS/MND) for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project, as adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on July 13, 2017.

Table 1 summarizes CPUC-approved Notice to Proceed (NTP) activities to-date for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project, based on activities proposed in PG&E's Notice to Proceed Requests (NTPRs).

Table 1 CPUC-approved NTP Activities for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

NTP#	Final NTPR Submittal Date	CPUC NTP Issuance Date	Description of Approved Activities
NTP #1	11/1/2018	11/2/2018	Work within both the existing Sanger Substation footprint and the expansion area, including laydown/staging area setup; installation of access driveways, fencing, foundations, substation equipment, and a microwave tower; and installation of two antenna dishes at an off-site location (Fence Meadow Repeater Station).

Table 2 summarizes all CPUC-approved Minor Project Refinements (MPRs) to-date for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project.

Table 2 CPUC-approved MPRs for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

MPR#	Final MPR Submittal Date	CPUC MPR Approval Date	Description of Minor Project Refinement
MPR #001	5/24/2018	6/12/2018	Minor modifications to the placement and types of poles in the "power line reconfiguration" project component to suit engineering refinements that were made after Final IS/MND approval. The modifications would occur approximately 2,100 feet west; 750 feet east; and 165 feet south of the existing Sanger Substation footprint. In total, there would be modifications to seven poles.

Table 2 CPUC-approved MPRs for the Sanger Substation Expansion Project

MPR#	Final MPR Submittal Date	CPUC MPR Approval Date	Description of Minor Project Refinement	
MPR #002	7/17/2018	7/20/2018	An additional temporary laydown yard/staging area (approximatel 974 feet by 112 feet) located north of the retention basin, running north between the western boundary of the substation expansion and the western boundary of the existing Sanger Substation footp This area is owned in fee title by PG&E.  Use of an existing water well approximately 100 feet north of	
MPR #003	11/13/2018	11/14/2018	Use of an existing water well approximately 100 feet north of approved NTP #1 work areas, within the same parcel as the Sanger Substation footprint. PG&E has obtained permission from the landowner to use this well for a specified timeframe. PG&E will access the well pump by foot, and will obtain water from this well for dust control purposes. MPR #3 adds no additional ground disturbance to the existing disturbance footprint, other than impacts from light foot traffic and temporary ground placement of a water hose.	

#### **Project Compliance Incidents**

Onsite compliance monitoring by the Ecology and Environment, Inc., member of WSP (hereafter referred to as E & E) compliance team during this reporting period focused on spot-checks of ongoing construction activities. Compliance Monitor Ben Arax visited the Sanger Substation construction site on **March 14 and March 29, 2019**. CPUC Compliance Monitoring Reports that summarize observed construction activities and compliance events and verify mitigation measures (MMs) and applicant proposed measures (APMs) were completed for the site visits. These reports are attached below (Attachment 1).

Overall, the Sanger Substation Expansion Project has maintained compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program's (MMCRP) Compliance Plan. Communication between the CPUC/E & E compliance team and PG&E has been regular and effective; the correspondence discussed and documented compliance events, upcoming compliance-related surveys and deliverables, and the construction schedule. PG&E biologists detected two active bird nests onsite in March. In both cases, PG&E implemented protection measures (e.g., disturbance buffers) and reporting protocols, as required by the MMCRP. Agency calls between the CPUC/E & E and PG&E, along with daily schedule updates and database notifications, provided additional compliance information and construction summaries. Furthermore, PG&E's weekly compliance status reports provided a compliance summary, a description of construction activities that occurred each week, a summary of compliance with MMCRP conditions (MMs/APMs) for biological, cultural and paleontological resources; the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP); noise and traffic control; onsite hazards; and the Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP), as well as any non-compliance issues and resolutions, and public complaints and notifications.

#### **Compliance Incidents and Minor Compliance Observations**

During the March 2019 reporting period, PG&E did not self-report any compliance incidents, and the CPUC did not issue any compliance incident reports. During the March 2019 reporting period, the CPUC Compliance Monitor noted that some erosion control best management practice (BMP) and SWPPP installations needed minor repairs following rain events. However, the BMPs continued to function as

Mr. Michael Rosauer May 28, 2019 Page 3

intended and repairs were addressed promptly.

#### **Noise Compliance**

During the March 2019 reporting period, there were no exceedances of the stipulated noise levels.

#### **Public Concerns**

No public concerns were reported during March 2019.

Sincerely,

Ilja Nieuwenhuizen

The Nieman hinzen

Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

cc:

Michael Calvillo, PG&E Carie Montero, Parsons Lincoln Allen, SWCA

### **ATTACHMENT 1**

# CPUC Compliance Monitoring Reports March 14 and 29, 2019



## **Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report**

Project Proponent	Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	Report No.	CM-CPUCBA-031419
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Date (mm/dd/yy)	03/14/19
CPUC Project Manager	Michael Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax
CPUC (Ecology and Environment, Inc., member of WSP [E & E]) Monitoring Manager	Ilja Nieuwenhuizen	AM/PM Weather	57° F, Sunny, Wind SSE 5 miles per hour (mph)
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Aileen Cole	Start/End Time	11:00 AM – 12:25 PM
Project Notices to Proceed NTP(s)	NTP #1		

**SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST** (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all onsite personnel (e.g., construction workers, managers, inspectors, monitors)?	Х		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)	Yes	No	N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (best management practices [BMPs]) been installed in accordance with the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)?	Х		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) installed correctly (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	Х		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways?	Х		
Is dust control being implemented, in accordance with the Dust Control Plan (e.g., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are covered with tarps, pull-outs and streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	Х		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	Х		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	Х		
Equipment	Yes	No	N/A
Are vehicles maintaining speed limits: 15 mph on unpaved roads/10 mph off-road?	Х		
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment/mud and noxious weeds or other plant debris?	Х		

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 1 of 7

Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	Х		
Work Areas	Yes	No	N/A
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	Х		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources, as appropriate?	Х		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	Х		
Are trenches/excavations covered at night, or when not possible, are wildlife escape ramps installed, constructed of earth fill or wooden planks no less than 10 inches wide?	Х		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have required preconstruction surveys been completed for biological resources (special status species, raptors and other nesting birds, burrowing owls, San Joaquin kit fox), as appropriate?	х		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	Х		
Is project complying with biological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	Х		
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features (e.g., is the refueling/maintenance buffer in place within 100 feet of the irrigation ditch)?	Х		
Has wildlife (sensitive species or not) been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		х	
Have impacts occurred on adjacent habitat (sensitive or not sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		Х	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		Х	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.	Х		
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are appropriate buffers/exclusion zones for identified sensitive cultural/paleo resources (e.g., cultural sites) clearly marked and being maintained?	Х		
Is the project in compliance with cultural/archaeological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	Х		
Is the project in compliance with paleontological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	Х		
Have there been any work stoppages for potential archaeological, cultural, or paleontological resources? If yes, describe below.		х	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used onsite properly managed?	Х		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	Х		

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 2 of 8

Are required fire prevention and control measures in place, and no crew members, managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?			
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or off-site disposal?			
Work Hours and Noise			N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?			
Is construction occurring within approved work hours?			
Are required noise control measures in place?	Х		

#### **AREAS MONITORED**

Project areas on and near the substation expansion footprint, existing substation, and the temporary laydown/staging area.

#### **DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES**

11:00 AM-I arrived onsite. Conditions were generally dry, with a few patches of mud.

11:05 AM- I met with Chennie Castañon (PG&E Environmental Inspector and Biologist) and Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector) to discuss current project activities. Mr. Clarkson explained that AJ Excavation crews were installing the permanent fencing that would later surround the substation expansion footprint (Photos 1, 2, 5, and 7), and prepping and pouring foundations for the new substation structures (Photos 4, 5, and 6). Ms. Castañon stated that there are two active Killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*) nests onsite, and that PG&E plans to remove 210 feet of silt fence running parallel to the retention basin west of the existing substation. The silt fence would be replaced with double layers of gravel rock bags for improved SWPPP effectiveness (APM GEO-2/APM WQ-1).

11:28 AM- At the start of the inspection, I observed a crew installing permanent fencing and the foundations for the substation structures (Photos 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7). I also observed a pump diverting water from the substation expansion footprint retention basin into the retention basin within the existing substation footprint (Photo 3).

11:46 AM- I requested that Ms. Castañon escort me to the Killdeer nest buffer boundaries. Ms. Castañon stated that one nest buffer reduction was approved by the CPUC (Photo 8), while the other (the nest south of the northern access road) does not currently have a reduced buffer. At the Killdeer nest within the existing substation footprint (nest KILLO2), the adult killdeer was a few feet away from the nest (not on it). At the other Killdeer nest (nest KILLO1, located south of the northern access road), the adult killdeer was observed sitting on the nest (Photo 9). Appropriate signage and buffers were observed for both nests (Photo 10). Neither sensitive resource was impacted by project-related activities (MM BIO-4).

12:00 PM- I asked Ms. Castañon about BMPs potentially arriving this week. Ms. Castañon specified that the BMPs have not arrived yet.

#### 12:25 PM- I left the project site.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED**

MM BIO-1, MM BIO-4, APM AIR-1, APM HAZ-3, MM HAZ-2, APM GHG-1, MM HAZ-1, APM GEO-2, APM WQ-1

See additional applicant proposed measures (APMs) and mitigation measures (MMs) listed in the Description of Observed Activities section.

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 3 of 8

RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP
COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS
<b>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</b> Below please describe any Compliance Incidents (Level 1, 2, or 3) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a compliance issue in the field, please note this on this monitoring form. In addition, Level 1, 2 or 3 Compliance Incidents, fill out and submit a separate Compliance Incident Report Form.
<b>☐ Level 0 Acceptable.</b> (no compliance incidents)
Level 1: Minor Problem. An event or observation that slightly deviates from project requirements, but does not put a resource at unpermitted risk. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.
Level 2: Compliance Deviation. An event or observation that deviates from project requirements and puts a resource at risk, or shows a trend toward placing resources at risk, but is corrected without affecting the resource. Repeated Level 1 Minor Problems left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 2 Compliance Deviation. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.
Level 3: Non-Compliance. An event or observation that violates project requirements and affects a resource. Repeated Level 2 Compliance Deviations left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 3 Incident. An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program (MMCRP) APMs or MMs, permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g., minor project changes, NTP), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.
Compliance Incidents reported by PG&E's Compliance Team
PG&E's Compliance Team reported Compliance Incidents since last CPUC Compliance Monitor visit. If boxed checked, describe issues and resolution status below.
Description: (include PG&E's report number)
New Sensitive Resources
New biological, environmental, cultural/archaeological, or paleontological discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc., has occurred since last CPUC Compliance Monitoring visit If checked, please describe the new discoveries and documentation/verification below.
<ul> <li>Description: Two Killdeer (<i>Charadrius vociferous</i>) bird nests have been discovered onsite by PG&amp;E's biologist:</li> <li>Nest KILLO2: nest with eggs, located on the ground, immediately south of the access road across the northern part of the project. PG&amp;E installed a 250-foot disturbance buffer around the nest. The nest (adult bird or eggs) do not appear to be disturbed by the project.</li> <li>Nest KILLO2: nest with eggs, located on the ground, on the western berm of the retention basin inside the substation expansion footprint. PG&amp;E biologist installed a 30-foot disturbance buffer around the nest (CPUC is reviewing this buffer size; it may need to be increased). The nest (adult bird or eggs) do not appear to be disturbed by the project.</li> </ul>
[Update on 03/20/19: CPUC approved a reduced buffer of 70 feet for nest KILL02. Minor project activities, such as operating the hose to dewater the retention basin, will remained permitted within the 70-foot buffer.]

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 4 of 8

Date	Level	Compliance Incident and Resolution	Relevant Mitigation Measure	Corresponding Level 1, 2, or 3 Report #

PREVIOUS COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS OR ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY: None.

REPRESENT	REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS					
Date	Location	Photo	Description			
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 1- Permanent fencing installed along McCall Avenue. Photo facing southeast.			
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 2- An AJ Excavation crew watering and compacting soil to install fence posts. Photo facing southwest.			

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 5 of 8

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 3- Pump and hose diverting water from the retention basin into the existing substation. Photo facing east.
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 4- Rebar for foundation installations. Photo facing north.
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 5- Materials for fence and foundation installations. Photo facing northeast.
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 6- Concrete poured for the foundations. Photo facing south.

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 6 of 8

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 7- Covered holes/excavations for permanent fence installation. Photo facing northwest.
03/14/19	Existing substation		Photo 8- Killdeer immediately south of its nest (KILLO2), located on the edge of the existing substation retention basin. Photo facing southeast.
03/14/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 9- Killdeer sitting on nest (KILLO1) immediately south of northern access road. Photo facing southwest.
03/14/19	Expansion footprint	Pacific Gas and Electric Company' SENSITIVE RESOURCE AREA KEEP OUT	Photo 10- Signage designating sensitive resources (Killdeer nest). Photo facing north.

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 7 of 8

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS				
Date	Location	Photo	Description	
Completed by:		Ben Arax		
Firm:		Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.		
Date:		03/14/19		
Reviewed by:		Patrick Sauls		
Firm:		Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.		
Date:		03/14/19		

CM-CPUCBA-031419 Page 8 of 8



## **Sanger Substation Expansion Project CPUC Compliance Monitoring Report**

Project Proponent	Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)	Report No.	CM-CPUCBA-032919
Lead Agency	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Date (mm/dd/yy)	03/29/19
<b>CPUC Project Manager</b>	Michael Rosauer	Monitor(s)	Ben Arax
CPUC (Ecology and Environment, Inc., member of WSP [E & E]) Monitoring Manager	Ilja Nieuwenhuizen	AM/PM Weather	57° F, Clear Wind WNW 13 miles per hour (mph)
CPUC (E & E) Monitoring Supervisor	Aileen Cole	Start/End Time	10:15 AM – 11:03 AM
Project Notices to Proceed NTP(s)	NTP #1		

**SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST** (Based on monitor's observations during site visit; responses do not imply that monitor observed all staff, crews, and parts of the project during this inspection)

Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) Training	Yes	No	N/A
Is the WEAP training in place and does it appear to have been completed by all onsite personnel (e.g., construction workers, managers, inspectors, monitors)?	Х		
Erosion and Dust Control (Air and Water Quality)			N/A
Have temporary erosion and sediment control measures (best management practices [BMPs]) been installed in accordance with the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)?	Х		
Are erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) installed correctly (without apparent deficiencies) and functioning as intended during rain events?	Х		
Are measures in place to avoid/minimize mud tracking onto public roadways?			
Is dust control being implemented, in accordance with the Dust Control Plan (e.g., access roads watered, haul trucks covered, dirt piles are covered with tarps, pull-outs and streets cleaned on a regular basis)?	Х		
Are work areas being effectively watered prior to excavation or grading?	Х		
Are measures in place to stabilize soils and effectively suppress fugitive dust?	Х		
Equipment		No	N/A
Are vehicles maintaining speed limits: 15 mph on unpaved roads/10 mph off-road?			
Are observed vehicles/equipment arriving onsite clean of sediment/mud and noxious weeds or other plant debris?	Х		

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 1 of 7

Are observed vehicles/equipment turned off when not in use?	Х		
Work Areas			N/A
Is vegetation disturbance within work areas minimized?	Х		
Is exclusionary fencing or flagging in place to protect sensitive biological or cultural resources, as appropriate?	Х		
Are observed vehicles, equipment, and construction personnel staying within approved work areas and on approved roads?	Х		
Are trenches/excavations covered at night, or when not possible, are wildlife escape ramps installed, constructed of earth fill or wooden planks no less than 10 inches wide?	Х		
Biology	Yes	No	N/A
Have required preconstruction surveys been completed for biological resources (special status species, raptors and other nesting birds, burrowing owls, San Joaquin kit fox), as appropriate?	х		
Are appropriate measures in place to protect sensitive habitat and/or drainages (i.e., flagging, signage, exclusion fencing, appropriate buffer distance enacted)?	Х		
Is project complying with biological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	Х		
If there are wetlands or water bodies near construction activities, are adequate measures in place to avoid impacts on these features (e.g., is the refueling/maintenance buffer in place within 100 feet of the irrigation ditch)?			
Has wildlife (sensitive species or not) been relocated from work areas? If yes, describe below.		х	
Have impacts occurred on adjacent habitat (sensitive or not sensitive)? If yes, describe below.		Х	
Did you observe any threatened or endangered species? If yes, describe below.		Х	
Have there been any work stoppages for biological resources? If yes, describe below.		Х	
Cultural and Paleontological Resources	Yes	No	N/A
Are appropriate buffers/exclusion zones for identified sensitive cultural/paleo resources (e.g., cultural sites) clearly marked and being maintained?	х		
Is the project in compliance with cultural/archaeological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	Х		
Is the project in compliance with paleontological monitoring requirements (e.g., if required, are monitors present)?	Х		
Have there been any work stoppages for potential archaeological, cultural, or paleontological resources? If yes, describe below.		х	
Hazardous Materials	Yes	No	N/A
Are hazardous materials that are stored or used onsite properly managed?	Х		
Are procedures in place to prevent spills and accidental releases?	Х		

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 2 of 7

Are required fire prevention and control measures in place, and no crew members, managers, or monitors are smoking onsite?			
Are contaminated soils properly managed for onsite storage or off-site disposal?			
Work Hours and Noise		No	N/A
Are required night lighting reduction measures in place?			
Is construction occurring within approved work hours?			
Are required noise control measures in place?			

#### **AREAS MONITORED**

Project areas on and near the substation expansion footprint, existing substation, and the temporary laydown/staging area.

#### **DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVED ACTIVITIES**

10:15 AM- I arrived onsite. Conditions were dry, but soil remained slightly damp. Prior to arrival, I discussed with Ilja Nieuwenhuizen (CPUC E & E Monitoring Manager) the status of the two Killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*) nests (KILL01 and KILL02) onsite: CPUC approved reduced buffer requests for both (to 150 feet and 70 feet, respectively). Upon arrival, Jeff Clarkson (PG&E Senior Civil Inspector) reported the day's planned activities. Mr. Clarkson also explained that a SWPPP inspector conducted a site sweep earlier this morning and planned to have the report finalized later in the day.

10:23 AM- I began the site inspection. I observed concrete footings with rebar in place for the substation impact buildings (Photo 1). I observed AJ Excavation crews watering soil (APM AIR-1), grading in the staging area (Photos 6, 8, and 9), pouring concrete for the substation impact buildings (Photo 11), installing fence (Photo 10), moving soil (Photo 2), and dewatering the retention basin. The expansion footprint appeared well organized, maintained, and in compliance (Photo 7). Vehicles not in use were turned off and staged away from other project activities (APM GHG-1). The Killdeers were observed on their nests (Photos 3, 4, and 5) inside the reduced nest buffers; neither nest appeared to be impacted by construction activities (MM BIO-4).

10:38 AM- I reviewed the updated project SWPPP storm reports (provided by Mr. Clarkson).

10:56 AM- I completed inspections. Before leaving the site, Chennie Castañon (PG&E Environmental Inspector and Biologist) mentioned that the Killdeer eggs at both nests were expected to hatch between April 8-10.

11:03 AM- I left the project site.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES VERIFIED**

MM BIO-1, MM BIO-4, APM AIR-1, APM HAZ-3, MM HAZ-2, APM GHG-1, MM HAZ-1, APM GEO-2, APM WQ-1

See additional applicant proposed measures (APMs) and mitigation measures MMs listed in the Description of Observed Activities section.

#### **RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP**

None.

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 3 of 7

COMPLIANCE SUGGESTIONS OR ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS				
<b>COMPLIANCE SUMMARY</b> Below please describe any Compliance Incidents (Level 1, 2, or 3) that have occurred since your last visit. If you observe a compliance issue in the field, please note this on this monitoring form. In addition, Level 1, 2 or 3 Compliance Incidents, fill out and submit a separate Compliance Incident Report Form.				
Level 1: Minor Problem. An event or observation that slightly deviates from project requirements, but does not put a resource at unpermitted risk. If you checked this box, describe the incident below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.				
Level 2: Compliance Deviation. An event or observation that deviates from project requirements and puts a resource at risk, or shows a trend toward placing resources at risk, but is corrected without affecting the resource. Repeated Level 1 Minor Problems left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 2 Compliance Deviation. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.				
Level 3: Non-Compliance. An event or observation that violates project requirements and affects a resource. Repeated Level 2 Compliance Deviations left unaddressed may also rise to a Level 3 Incident. An action that deviates from project requirements and has caused, or has the potential to cause major impacts on environmental resources. These actions are not in compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Program (MMCRP) APMs or MMs, permit conditions, or approval requirements (e.g., minor project changes, NTP), and/or violates local, state, or federal law. If box is checked, summarize below and fill out a separate Compliance Incident Form.				
Compliance Incidents reported by PG&E's Compliance Team				
PG&E's Compliance Team reported Compliance Incidents since last CPUC Compliance Monitor visit. If boxed checked, describe issues and resolution status below.  Description: (include PG&E's report number)				
New Sensitive Resources				
New biological, environmental, cultural/archaeological, or paleontological discovery requiring compliance with mitigation measures, permit conditions, etc., has occurred since last CPUC Compliance Monitoring visit If checked, please describe the new discoveries and documentation/verification below.				
Relevant Mitigation Level 1, 2, or 3  Date Level Compliance Incident and Resolution Measure Report #				
PREVIOUS COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS OR ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP OR RESOLVED TODAY: None.				

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 4 of 7

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/29/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 1- Foundations for substation impact buildings. Photo facing southwest.
03/29/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 2- Compact track loader and skip loader moving soil. Photo facing west.
03/29/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 3- Buffer surrounding Killdee nest KILLO1, near the northern acces road. Photo facing west.
03/29/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 4- Killdeer sitting inside the reduced KILLO1 nes buffer. Photo facing south.

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 5 of 7

Date	Location	Photo	Description
03/29/19	Existing substation		Photo 5- Killdeer observed on nest (KILLO2). Photo facing east.
03/29/19	Temporary staging area	A A REGISTRATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	Photo 6- Blade grading staging area. Photo facing southwest.
03/29/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 7- Rebar and other construction materials being stored for future use. Photo facing southeast.
03/29/19	Temporary staging area		Photo 8- Scraper grading within the future staging area Photo facing west.

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 6 of 7

REPRESENTATIVE SITE PHOTOGRAPHS				
Date	Location	Photo	Description	
03/29/19	Temporary staging area		Photo 9- Water truck spraying water on soil. Photo facing southwest.	
03/29/19	Temporary staging area		Photo 10- AJ excavation workers installing fence posts. Photo facing south.	
03/29/19	Expansion footprint		Photo 11- Crew pouring concrete for substation impact building. Photo facing east.	

Completed by:	Ben Arax
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	03/29/19
Reviewed by:	Patrick Sauls
Firm:	Soar Environmental Consulting, Inc.
Date:	03/29/19

CM-CPUCBA-032919 Page 7 of 7